



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/802,614 | 03/17/2004 | David M. Ziemann | 14846-53 | 4784 |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|------|------------|
| 28221 | 7590 | 01/15/2008 |
| PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR | | |
| LOWENSTEIN SANDLER PC | | |
| 65 LIVINGSTON AVENUE | | |
| ROSELAND, NJ 07068 | | |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| EXAMINER | |
| CAO, PHUONG THAO | |

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 2164 | |

| | |
|------------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| 01/15/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

AK

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/802,614

Applicant(s)

ZIEMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Phuong-Thao Cao

Art Unit

2164

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Phuong-Thao Cao, Examiner.(3) Daniel D. Sierchio, Attorney (Reg. No. 53,591).(2) Sana Al-Hashemi, Primary Examiner.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 09 January 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1.Identification of prior art discussed: Jagadish et al. ("TIMBER: A native XML database", 2002).Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


SANA AL-HASHEMI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
 Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Attorney presented an argument that neither Jagadish nor Lindblad, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest applying a mask to the input data to generate a query tree which is applied to the collection of tree data structures to identify an identified tree. Examiners explained how specific limitations "generating a query tree having a tree data structure by applicationa mask to the input data to generate the query tree, wherein the mask and the input data each correspond to a tree data structure" (limitation 1) and "applying the query tree to the collection of tree data structures in the database to identify an identified tree consistent with the query tree" (limitation 1) were taught by Jagadish based on broad interpretation. Since a mask, query tree and input data were all recited as tree data structure without any specific structure or feature to distinguish among them, any tree data structure (tree) can broadly interpreted as a mask, query tree or input data. As a result, the disclosure [page 278, paragraph 4] of operation taking as input one or more sets of tree and producing as output a set of tree read on limitation 1; and the disclosure [page 278, paragraph 5] of selection operation which applied a pattern tree against a collection of trees to identify witness trees consistent to the pattern tree read on limitation 2. Attorney agreed to consider amending claims to further specify the claimed invention.